



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,853	01/22/2004	Robert Sesek	200206923-1	5874

22879 7590 05/02/2007
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, JAMILA O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3722

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/762,853

Applicant(s)

SESEK ET AL.

Examiner

Jamila Williams

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 20-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 20-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 20 it is unclear what is encompassed by the following phrase: "means for photographing a subject once the camera is oriented". Applicant needs to clarify what is meant by the "means for" limitations and how they further limit the guidebook being claimed.

In view of applicant's response to a similar rejection in the last office action, applicant has explained, and it is understood by the examiner that the first three means recited in claim 20 refer to types of indicia in the guidebook. Accordingly, the rejection as applied to these portions of claim 20 has been withdrawn. On the other hand, it is still unclear how the guidebook as claimed can be said to comprise a camera.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 4,965,948 to Ruebens.

Ruebens discloses a photography guidebook comprising a plurality of blank photograph locations (22) and a plurality of writing surfaces (34) with preprinted indicia imprinted thereon (35,36).

Ruebens discloses the claimed invention except for the specific arrangement and/or content of the indicia (printed matter) set forth in the claims (i.e. photograph descriptions including one or more of camera location, coordinates, magnetic bearing of the lens, inclination of camera, shutter speed, an aperture, a plurality of environmental conditions, film type, recited in claim 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to alter the indicia since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401 (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of information/instruction does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter (photograph descriptions) and the substrate (guidebook) that is required for patentability.

Regarding claims 3-4, Ruebens discloses that the descriptions are placed in a portion of the guidebook separate from the photograph locations, the descriptions are placed adjacent their photograph locations (see figure 1 for example).

Regarding claim 5, Ruebens discloses that the descriptions comprise a caption for the photograph and a set of technical details of the photograph locations (see figure 1 and the *In re Gulack* rejection above).

Regarding claim 6, Ruebens discloses that the technical details are placed in a portion of the guidebook separate from the photograph locations and captions (figure 1).

Regarding claims 7-9 see rejections of claims 1-3 above.

Regarding claims 20-22, (as best understood in view of the 112 above), Ruebens discloses a guidebook for taking photographs comprising the means claimed.

Regarding claim 22, wherein the means for photographing comprises a camera that allows for the reproduction of the photograph details, cameras (both analog and digital) that reproduce photograph details are well known. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a camera that allows for reproduction of photograph details (film type, aperture or shutter speed for example) for the purpose of producing a more quality picture.

Claims 10-13 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D468,350 to Sussman et al (hereinafter Sussman) or 6,257,621 to Smith in view of 965,948 to Ruebens. Both Sussman and Smith disclose a system comprising a camera and guidebook having a plurality of blank photograph locations (see claim and figure 2 of Sussman which appears to show a camera mounted in the

front cover and a plurality of pages with photos mounted thereon; see fig 1 and column 3 lines 50-53 of Smith).

Neither Sussman nor Smith show a plurality of photograph descriptions of the blank photograph locations.

Ruebens teaches having preprinted indicia associated with the photos (35,36).

Regarding the specific arrangement and/or content of the indicia (printed matter) set forth in the claims (i.e. photograph descriptions including one or more of camera location, coordinates, magnetic bearing of the lens, inclination of camera, shutter speed, an aperture, a plurality of environmental conditions, film type recited in claim 11), it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to alter the indicia since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401 (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of information/instruction does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter (photograph descriptions) and the substrate (guidebook) that is required for patentability.

Regarding claim 12, Sussman or Smith (modified by Ruebens) discloses the descriptions are placed in a portion of the guidebook separate from the photograph locations (figure 1 of Ruebens).

Regarding claim 13, Sussman or Smith (modified by Ruebens) discloses the descriptions are placed adjacent their respective photograph locations (figure 1 of Ruebens).

Regarding claims 23-24, Sussman or Smith (modified by Ruebens) discloses the system comprising a guidebook having a plurality of photograph locations and technical details for identifying each of the blank photograph locations (figure 2 of Sussman, figure 1 of Smith, figure 1 of Ruebens) and means for replicating the technical details (camera of Sussman or Smith).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11-3-2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the traverse of the indefiniteness rejection, note the examiner's comments above (under 112).

Applicant's comments regarding In re Gullack are noted. On the other hand, the examiner disagrees that the printed matter is clearly and unambiguously related to the substrate as urged by the applicant. Accordingly the rejection has not been withdrawn.

Applicant's comments regarding the lack of preprinted indicia on Ruebens are noted. On the other hand, the examiner directs applicant's attention to "MEMO"

preprinted on the pages. This satisfies the claimed preprinted indicia. In view of the case cited above and in the rejection itself, the indicia of the claims at bar would have been obvious in view of the indicia in the reference.

Applicant's traverse of the rejections over Sussman and Smith is also noted. In response, the comments above regarding In re Gullack are also applicable to the rejections over these references.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. This is simply art of interest and was not used to reject any claims in this office action.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3722

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamila Williams whose telephone number is 571-272-4431. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Monica Carter can be reached on 571-272-4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



JW 4-27-2007


MONICA CARTER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER